

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/383,629	08/26/1999	MAZDA SALMANIAN	71493-582	6818
. 75	590 06/10/2003			
SMART & BIGGAR P O BOX 2999 STATION D 900-55 METCALFE STREET			EXAMINER	
			LEVITAN, DMITRY	
OTTAWA, K CANADA	IPSYP		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2662	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003



Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- ";], .	-27	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	Advisory Action	09/383,629	SALMANIAN, MAZDA			
	in the state of th	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Dmitry Levitan	2662			
•	-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
final conc	REPLY FILED 5/16/03 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF efore, further action by the applicant is required to av rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) lition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal mination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR oid abandonment of this applica	R ALLOWANCE.			
	PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
b) Efee ha	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The convergence of the date for purposes of determining the period of der 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the convergence of t	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CFF extension and the corresponding amounts.	or date of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension			
imely	filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CF A Notice of Appeal was filed on \$28/03 Appellant's terms.	R 1.704(b).	ng date of the final rejection, even if			
	37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered bed	1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	the appeal.			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(-	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	low);				
	they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or					
(a	they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	g a corresponding number of fin	ally rejected claims			
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	n(s):				
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	e allowable if submitted in a sep	parate, timely filed amendment			
5.🛛	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reapplication in condition for allowance because: See (econsideration has been consideration Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the			
S. 🗌	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becauraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	se it is not directed SOLELY to	issues which were newly			
′ 🛛	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) explanation of how the new or amended claims would) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)⊑ d be rejected is provided below	will be entered and an or appended.			
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
	Claim(s) allowed:					
	Claim(s) objected to: 5-9 and 11-13.					
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,10,14-16 and 18-20</u> .	•				
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 17.					
	The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)[☐ approved or b)☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner			
. 🗌 1	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s	s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	,			
	Other:	HASSAN KIZOU				
atent an	id Trademark Office	SUPERVISORY PATENT E				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner believes that claims 1-4,10,19-20 are unpatentable over Scholefield in view of Beming, claim 14 is rejected under 112 USC first paragraph and claims 14-16 are rejected under 112 USC second paragraph.